



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,142	01/25/2006	Peter Von Zimmermann	07781.0229-00	2084
60668 7590 05/11/2009 SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
EXAMINER KANERVO, VIRPI H				
ART UNIT 3691		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 05/11/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/529,142

Applicant(s)

VON ZIMMERMANN ET AL.

Examiner

VIRPI H. KANERVO

Art Unit

3691

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 17-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 17-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

1. Claims 1-11 and 17-26 are presented for examination. Applicant filed an amendment on 02/04/2009 amending claims 1 and 26. In light of Applicant's amendments, Examiner withdraws the objection to claim 26, and the § 101 rejection of claims 1-10. Examiner has carefully considered Applicant's arguments directed to the § 103 rejection of claims 1-11 and 17-26, but finds them not persuasive. Since Examiner has maintained the previous grounds of the § 103 rejection, the rejection of claims 1-11 and 17-26 is a FINAL rejection of the claims.

Response to Arguments

2. In light of Applicant's amendments, Examiner withdraws the objection to claim 26.
3. In light of Applicant's amendments, Examiner withdraws the § 101 rejection of claims 1-10.

4. Nip (2003/0212682 A1) reference: Applicant argues that Nip fails to teach "storing, using a storage device, the output data record with in identification code." Applicant argues specifically that "there is no database for storing an output data record in Nip." Examiner disagrees. Nip discloses specifically that "the requestor identifier/output table contains a mapping from each unique requestor identifier-output identifier combination to the associated output specification in the output specification database" (Nip: page 2, ¶ 27; where the output specification is "output data record," and it is stored in the output specification database). Therefore, Nip discloses "database for storing an output data record."
5. Nip in view of Musmanno (5,940,809): Applicant argues that "it would not have been obvious to combine the elements of Musmanno with that of Nip in view of their divergent teachings and, if they could be combined, such combination would not have produced a computer implemented method for automatically filing documents relating to business transactions to store data relating to a business transaction." Examiner disagrees.

The rationale to support a conclusion that the claim would have been obvious is that (1) all the claimed elements were known in the prior art; (2) one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions; and (3) the combination

would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. See *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

Here, (1) Nip discloses all the other elements of the claim 1, except the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions and to one or more business applications; transforming, using a processor, the at least one input data record into an output data record that can be configured using one or more of the business applications; and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the at least two business applications by referring to the identification code. Musmanno discloses the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions and to one or more business applications; transforming, using a processor, the at least one input data record into an output data record that can be configured using one or more of the business applications; and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the at least two business applications by referring to the identification code. Thus, all the claimed elements were known in the prior art. (2) Musmanno does not change the existing elements in Nip. Also, the elements in Musmanno, which are combined with the elements of Nip, remain the same after combining the elements of Nip and Musmanno. Therefore, one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions. (3) The results of combination of Nip and Musmanno are

predictable because the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Therefore, claims 1-11 and 17-26 are obvious over Nip in view of Musmanno under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in § 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-11 and 17-26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nip (2003/0212682 A1) in view of Musmanno (5,940,809).

As to claims 1, 11, and 26, Nip shows producing, using a processor, at least one input data (Nip: page 2, ¶ 22) and storing, in a storage device, the output data with an identification code (Nip: page 2, ¶ 27).

Nip does not show the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions and to one or more business applications; transforming, using a processor, the at least one input data record into an output data record that can be configured using one or more of the business

applications; and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the at least two business applications by referring to the identification code. Musmanno shows the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 11-13) and to one or more business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 25-27); transforming, using a processor, the at least one input data record into an output data record that can be configured using one or more of the business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 27-28); and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the at least two business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13) by referring to the identification code (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 42-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions and to one or more business applications; transforming, using a processor, the at least one input data record into an output data record that can be configured using one or more of the business applications; and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the at least two business applications by referring to the identification code of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 2 and 17, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip does not show that the producing step is performed using a first program module, the transforming step is performed using a second program module, and where the input data record having the specific structure is transferred from the first program module via an interface to the second program module. Musmanno shows that the producing step is performed using a first program module, the transforming step is performed using a second program module, and where the input data record having the specific structure is transferred from the first program module via an interface to the second program module (Musmanno: Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 65-67; and col. 4, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the producing step being performed using a first program module, the transforming step being performed using a second program module, and where the input data record having the specific structure is transferred from the first program module via an interface to the second program module of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 3 and 18, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of to claims 1 and 11. Nip does not show that the business application is in the form of a third or further program module. Musmanno shows that the business application is in the form of a third or further program module (Musmanno: Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 65-67; and col. 4, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the business application being in the form of a third or further program module of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 4 and 19, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of claims 3 and 11. Nip does not show that the second program module is in a form such that the transformation process in the transforming step can be set by the third program module via an interface. Musmanno shows that the second program module is in a form such that the transformation process in the transforming step can be set by the third program module via an interface (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 16-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the second program module being in a form such that the transformation process in the transforming step can be set by the third program module via an interface of

Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 5 and 20, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of claims 3 and 19. Nip does not show that the second program module is in a form such that it can read data, which can be selected using the at least two business applications, from the output data record upon a data request from the third program module and can transfer the data to the third program module via an interface for processing or display. Musmanno shows that the second program module is in a form such that it can read data, which can be selected using the at least two business applications, from the output data record upon a data request from the third program module and can transfer the data to the third program module via an interface for processing or display (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the second program module being in a form such that it can read data, which can be selected using the at least two business applications, from the output data record upon a data request from the third program module and can transfer the data to the third program module via an interface for processing or display of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for

managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 6 and 21, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of claims 5 and 20. Nip does not show that the selectable data can be selected by the third program module. Musmanno shows that the selectable data can be selected by the third program module (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the selectable capable of being selected by the third program module of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 7 and 22, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip does not show that the output data record is stored on a transactional basis. Musmanno shows that the output data record is stored on a transactional basis (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the output data record being stored on a transactional basis of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 8 and 23, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip does not show that the output data record includes, for a plurality of business applications, a database structure having one or more tables. Musmanno shows that the output data record includes, for a plurality of business applications, a database structure having one or more tables (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 6-8 and lines 52-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the output data record including, for a plurality of business applications, a database structure having one or more tables of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 9 and 24, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip does not show that the output data record includes, for different journals in accounting, different data areas. Musmanno shows that the output data record includes, for different journals in accounting, different data areas (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 56-67; and col. 6, lines 1-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the output data record including, for different journals in accounting, different data areas of Musmanno in order to provide an

enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 10 and 25, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip does not show that the output data record is designed for access via at least two business applications. Musmanno shows that the output data record is designed for access via at least two business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the output data record being designed for access via at least two business applications of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR § 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VIRPI H. KANERVO whose telephone number is 571-272-9818. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander G. Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Virpi H. Kanervo

/Alexander Kalinowski/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691